P.F. 56 of 97.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1895-96.

~~192~~ .

(L. R.)

File No. 114 of 95

Serial Nos. 1—7

(48)

Later references.

LR 208-27-165

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—7

M. ~~Part~~ B for April 1898.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Siddappa s/o Bafanapalli, Dharwar Taluk regarding his Shanbhogi Claim.—

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

Bott

Mr Shaughnessy has clearly admitted that he has undertaken this responsibility when he knew that he was not competent to undertake it. He has also admitted that he was not competent to undertake it without authority. He has given no good reason for his having done this. This is the first time he has done it. He is not competent to undertake it. He is not competent to undertake it. He is not competent to undertake it.

Col. Bott's letter

Plaintiff's Exhibit

2/8/96

Bell Telephone Company

Abstract of the records connected with the removal from service of Plaintiff's late of Imperial Village in the Province of Ontario for disobeying Govt. orders.

Facts of the case are:—

This case arose on the 11th of January 1895 at the District Office of the Plaintiff's Company at Hamilton, Ont. The Plaintiff (Govt) in his evidence said that the date which he complained of was said to him in 1894 for the 2nd time there was a similar complaint by this same complainant whereon the Plaintiff was found fault with for disobeying Govt. orders.

The 2nd Exhibit refers to the complaint to the 2nd date in 1895 for which the Plaintiff was dismissed from the Govt. service.

The Plaintiff's evidence on the 2nd date is not a complete report.

The Plaintiff's evidence on the 1st date is not a complete report from the reports on the 1st of the case.

Ans. from Mr Bell 31/8

Bell Telephone Company Abstract

Bell Telephone Co. 1895 of C

case & write a long letter to the place. 1/6 [illegible]
He by Hamilton in his turn after
examining the parties & the witness
on 2 d. 2d. 3d. made a requisition to the
Dl= for the old records of the case on
14. 4. 95 & ordered the Plaintiff to
examine Timber Cases, & produce
the latter was accordingly examined
on 5. 5. 95. after the receipt of the
old records on 8. 5. 95 the Dy Jurs=
also examined Timber Cases on
13. 5. 95 & finally submitted his report Plaintiff No 2/3
on 22. 5. 95 after taking a part of
confessional statement from the Plaintiff No 1/3
Plaintiff on 20. 5. 95. The Dy Jurs=
on 3. 6. 96 issued notice to the Dy Jurs=
to obtain a mechanic from the Plaintiff No 2/3
parties for their attendance before
him (D.C.) on a date & place to be
then & there attended and the
Plaintiff attendance could not be
secured during the Jamabandy
owing to his ill illness. The receipt
of the Dy Jurs= 5. 6. 96 & 21. 6. 96 says
that he has taken mechanic from
the parties for their attendance on
the 30th inst. There is a civil
suit on the file of the Dy Jurs= Mr. - 00 -
appealed against Mr. 3. 4. 96 & the
first the parties have been asked
to be present - the next day
the 4th day of Jurs=, Cases dismissed
reserving the Plaintiff from bringing
a fresh suit under the Limitation Law
Act & the Dy Jurs= on 3. 6. 96.

2 The original complaint of Lucian Brown & Co. of 9th Dec. 1896 in this matter is founded upon that the Petd & the Plaintiffs being in partnership [illegible] him lot of Timber & that the Petd refused to account for the proceeds of the sale thereof. Subsequently the Petd & another (Buchanan) had certain charges laid against the Plaintiffs regarding the latter's appropriation of certain piles & timber & thereupon the Petd caused a writ of Fi. Fa. to be issued out of this Court & placed in the hands of the Sheriff of Kootenay for execution. The Sheriff seized the goods & chattels of the Plaintiffs & duly returned the writ unsatisfied. The Plaintiffs then issued a writ of Fi. Fa. against the goods & chattels of the Petd & placed the same in the hands of the Sheriff of Kootenay for execution. The Sheriff seized the goods & chattels of the Petd

they will not speak to their facts.

Plaint No 1/4

Shanbogue Siddappa states that he heard the depositions of G. Iriga the compt.; that there is Tid between them both for a long time; that the compt. has been fighting with him & complaining against him now & then; the land wh. the compt. shows was an old dilapidated pit; that water used to stand in it from which emanated bad smell in the village; that he therefore covered it up at an expense of Rs 130 or 140, with the mud dug out of the Dieué over wh. Kumbar Rama's house is now built; that thereupon a complaint was made by the compt.; that the Special Apt. formerly Venkata Narasinga estimated the value of the 2 Vattarams at 3 Rs; that he has paid the said 3 Rs; that he herewith produced copy of the last order sin to the Sheikdar with reference to the old case; that after the pest event he did not cut Govt. hedges & the compound wall on the Govt. land nor did he build houses thereon & sell it Kumbar Rama that there was no compound wall there but there was a pit; that the villagers are aware of all this that on a portion of the land first mi ~~th~~ thrown up by him he

N.B. It is the Dy Commr. who has forbidden that passed this order Vide Calendar in the file.

1/4/2 Note:- This shows that 1 Rs was ordered to be recovered for the site on wh. Sonnalatada Subba's house is built + 2 Rs for the site lying to the east of the Chavadi

built a thatched house & sold it to Kumbar Rama for 30 Rs; that he did not misappropriate anything new now; that though his brother & himself are Patel & Shanbogue of the village respectively yet they are not giving the ryots any trouble; that the complainant has been frequently complaining against him; that he has no other old records with him but they may be found in the Taluk office; & that he does not know if the lands were measured then.

The Mahazar of the villagers says:- "Shanbogue Siddappa has covered up the pit, that extended from Kumbar Rama's house up to the road, at his own expense, with the mud dug out of the Dinné over which Kumbar Rama's house is now built. He also built a mud house on the northern side of this pit & a thatched house to the south. Whereupon Gunjuri Eerramma complained against the Shanbogue. The matter was enquired into & in the end the Shanbogue was given the land on which Bommalatada Subba's house is built, for the

Plaint Rs 1/5-

who called upon the Minister on P.E.I. 4
for a report. The Minister on P.E.I.
examined Enquiries Bureau Municipal Council
of Hamilton with the United States
a Railway from the north.

By Order adjourned [illegible] Bridge
have been collected from the
Municipality in the Office of the Mini-
-ster appointed Land Valuator
to build a Public House
to build all Station to the
south of the building erected by
the Municipality for the record
to the Union in the Control of
Hamilton House. From that
Union to the end of Hamilton Road
House, viz, about 2 miles 30 chains
& 3 miles from 1st to 2nd about 2 miles 30
was Good Land everywhere with
Limestone to hedge & dry easily being
cut, the house seems to have been
erected there; This Station has
been sold by the Municipality to Hamilton
Road. This land was part the original
of the original Consultant. This land
was recently taken up. There are also
on this land, besides the Station
house, 2 Barns etc. This land was
taken up 3 or 4 years ago. Lost in
4 or 5 Complaints about this but
in vain. Though the Engineer knows
that the hedge, the Ditch & the
Embankment will have cost 3pl

Jiwan Lama to the west of this house he was asked to pay 2 Rs. He did not pay upon any of the allegation of Jiwan Lama viz. that the Kamboje Bhaichyo irrigated some 5 or 6 years ago the land on which Kumbar Lama's house is built and that the Kamboje, the stone wall which existed there. The Kamboje did not misappropriate anything from Jiwan. So he was called from the Kamboje for the land which the complainant refers to. The Kamboje did not call to Kumbar Lama. The Kamboje & the Pati stone wall is also not giving us any trouble.

The report of the Panchas along with a rough sketch is also sent herewith enclosed the above statement.

I Before the Panchas, Jiwan Lama, Kamboje Bhaichyo & the Ryots were examined on Oath.

Jiwan says the same thing he has said before the Panchas that the land lying to the west of the Kamboje house including Formulated Bhitta was in the possession given in 1965 to the Kamboje for 5 Rs. after

Annexure 4

measurement; and that to the
South of this land he has cul-
tivated belonging to Gor. ½ &
built a house thereon which it
to Khundan Lama; & that the
Villagers are afraid to speak
against the Lamaboju. & he
also says in addition that he
has fined me for cutting Govt
Bamboo tree, & me for encroaching
upon Govt land, at the instance
of the Lamaboju.

The Lamaboju has subsequently before Mr. D ½
the Asst ½ that he paid to the Peiktar
& the villagers have also joined — Rs ½
suit.

I & the owners of the Asst ½ J. S. & J.
Khundan Lama was examined by — Rs ½
the Peiktar on 7. 8. 20. & he deposed
that Lamaboju Nandhia sold the
house to him for Rs. which is
built in the land whereon Lasiya
says that Lamaboju cut Govt bamboos;
that no document was executed;
that he paid the money on the delivery
of the Lamaboju; that he has no
references on the subject; & that
he would be present before the
Asst ½ on the 10 th instant.

On the 13 th the Asst ½ examined — Rs ½
him & then he deposed that he
lives before in Pattarkote; that he
& two living in this village, Ostrasapelli

for the last 2 years & that I am the owner of the Kauhope Estate for a term, the Kauhope Estate has attached thereto 4 Native Grants & Leases & that he does not know the extent & that he lived in the house with the Kauhope & that he does not know if the Letters belong to the Estate or the Kauhope & that the Kauhope told it to him & that the Kauhope told him he got the document from him (Pl.)

The Appellant then read another to the Court for the said Record & the case on the 3.5.95 received it on the case on the 3.5.95.

Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 10/5/95

On the 3.5.95 the Appellant took a statement from the Kauhope who showed as follows:-

"As explained by Pupisi Isaga of Apiaapiai, that from the time when Tasuai the late of Tuasivi died in 1886 — which is mentioned in the Calendar then prepared before me: I says:- 17½ Sts. I & 2 pcs. 1½ of Native land in front of the Native house 13½ yds Sts. I & 2 pcs. 1½ of the remaining land I cannot accurately measured by

John

Gov, the Agent of the Govt of Seminagar
Range I found to be the property
of Govt containing 2 1/2, 3 & 4 to 1
& 1 2 3 & 4 to 1 & 2 to 1 & 2 to 1
and the Native Dwelling Houses.
I expend 50 or 60 £ to build a Watcher
House of Mr Mackenzie on the land
measuring 2 Gov & 1 to 1 & 1 Gov 2 to 1
It is true that I told the house
to Number Cama for 2 Rs. I did
not instruct a Writer to the Govt
to obtain this Letter. What order
I have done chiefly is to clear
the land from Nagary Number &
with Great Success, & then titled
it up. I pray the Govt to give it
to me on a Cultivation. It is our
mistake to have done all this
without obtaining the permission
of the Govt. I beg to be excused
this time."

On 22 Gov the Govt submitted
final Report to the Govt with his Plan dated 2/3
Letter. His observations are
contained in the last Para of R— 2/3
contained in the last Para of R—

"Seeing all this, no such acts
of misappropriation are occasioned
by the fact of the Chief & the Mandlois
being District out-door Servants (for we)
have no legal Power to punish offenders
although they have (for the last) been
punished for building a House

on the ground without permission.
The Landlord owns the ~~land~~ ground
& flowers in the shrubbery belongs
to Smith. It appears from the
records that the lands originally
misappropriated were given away
to him at the rate of Rs. 4/-
p.a. & he has retained this
very act from which Smith proper-
ly gains nothing. The land is also
~~becoming~~ collecting from him at the rate
of Rs 10/- p.a. both for the
vacant site & that on which the
house is built."

Plaintiff's

5. The Counsel for the Defendant
then addressed the Court and the
parties before him & on behalf of
the Court decided to say that the
parties are asked to be present
before the Magistrate on the 15th instant.
The Council then on the 15th days
that the parties are asked to be
present to-morrow (the 16th). On the
16th the Counsel for the Defendant
only appeared & the Plaintiff
is absent.

6. The Landlord's Counsel then
has been ordered to appear before the
Court & is also present & the
Counsel on his part on a
former occasion was ~~dealt~~ dealt with
leniently & this has evidently
encouraged him to repeat the
act & hence Counsel

the year's rent for it & he to sue. Dana and she is thus clearly liable to be punished for breach of trust.

The Relet & the Planique being better the action did not come to light immediately

The Planique is therefore directed to be removed from service. The Builder should send a competent person for the office from amongst the workmen if any, who are not closely related to the dismissed individual.

Dana should pay for the rent at one cent per yard."

* He had also submitted a petition for the rent being cancelled.

6 Men with regard to the question whether the land now complained of is the same as that in dispute the subject of enquiry in 1876 on the complaint of the very complainant, you will bear in mind has to be referred to the calendar on which the orders of the Commissioners are based viz the charges stated by the plaintiff on the orders of the Govt as to the valuation of the land & buildings & which also fixes incidentally its measurements & limits of those fixes the boundaries. The charges above referred to are as follows: -

"File directed to the rent of Mr Patel house & the Mr Patel (unknown) by dwelling it to Rs 12 from 1st Jan 1880 to 31st Dec 1880 Rs 12"

site in front of ~~his~~ another
~~Watched~~ house.

this statement on the ground that it was not required by any writing.

The Court cannot herein for ~~to~~ exercise brought attempt to give the geography of the place as collected from the record though it is not possible to demarcate what lands were misappropriated nor what in 1856; nor is it clear what lands the complainants claim misappropriated now in the Complaint.

M.K.
12/8/96

15

Petitioner Ratchappa Lakshappa
Shanbogue of Bopsandra
Sreenivasapur Sub Taluk
appealed from an order of
the Deputy Commissioner Kolar
Mr. B. G. Krishnayar dismissing
him from the Shanbogue
for misappropriating a
Government site in the Village.
The appeal having been
admitted, the Dy Commr
was asked to send the
records in the case & to submit
a report. The records and
the report have now been
received.

In ~~the year~~ 1885 one
Geeramma of the same Village
complained that the petitioner



Close by the former site by
unauthorizedly putting up a
building thereon & selling
the whole to one Kumbar
Rama for Rs. 40. In
~~copy~~ justification the
petitioner urged that the site
on which the building sold
to Rama stood formed
a portion of the original site
for which he had paid in
1887. Thereupon the Assistant
undertook the task of examining
himself. He personally
inspected the shot-and Lai
the sites measured in the
presence of the Shanbhogue
being guided in that by the
record of 1886. It was found
that the Shanbhogue was in
the enjoyment of an excess
of Government site. This
the petitioner admitted

in writing & prayed for pardon
for his omission & stated
the matter to Government &
requested that the present
Case might be dealt with
as the former case had
been. The Deputy Amildar
submitted the whole record
to the D.C. Commissioner - &
recommended the levy from
the petitioner of a charge
at 2 per Cent on the excess
enjoyed by him.

Thereupon the D.C. Commissioner
directed the Amildar to
bind the petitioner & the complainant
before him on a date to be
fixed by him. Both of them
undertook in writing to attend
on 13-4-96. On this date
the petitioner
admits not having attended
the D.C. Commissioner's office
but excuses himself on the

had been appointed some
years since. After enquiry
the Similar reported
the matter to the Deputy
Commissioner & recommended
the levy of a charge on the
site at one fee per square
yard. This was considered
too low a rate & the then
Mr Cobbold
Commrs increased the
charge to Rs 2 1/1 to
be collected from the Chamber.
Who evidently acquiesced
in the order & who
paid the imposition. The
matter stopped there for
the time being.

In 1894 the same Com-
plainant & Secretary pre-
ferred against the petitioner
a second similar complaint
of their having misappropriated
some other Government site

Jeduna Kai Adeniran heard that
the Officer ~~in charge of the~~
~~was at~~ was at Ibadan on that date
he left for that place where he
returned to Ibadan after his
dismissal on the 14th of his absence
without any communication of the
Award. The order grounds the
dismissal on the misappropriation
of a Govt. title by the Chairman but
decides that a competent
Builder not closely related
to them should be selected by
the Institution in an appeal to
Government. From this title
The following are the grounds
of appeal:

1. That the title occasioning
his dismissal is included in
the title for which he paid
in 1[illegible]

2. That his deposition
before the Arbitrators admitting
an excess of Enjoyment of title

x and also notices his absence of the Chairperson though warned to appear before them

Government till was taken
at interest when he was ill.
3 That the W.D. Commissioner was
not at Kolar on the date of his
4 That himself & his brother
Moses often lived
Separately
5. And that the order of Provincial
was passed in his absence
& without notice to him.

Submitted

B.R.

18/8/91

21

Petn no 3370 dated 15-1-97

Rotn.
17/7/97

Ask the petn
whether it as
the undersigned
partnership
- says that the
orders already
passed are final
the matter cannot
be reopened

17.7.97.

Give the
usual instr
(to the branch
from, as)
17/7/97

Instr put up
15/7/97

16-7-97

22

1896 (1)

Stamp sufficient

In time

Does not require the Govt Council sanc.

Sanct. Letter 12/6/96

Sd. 12/6/96

Collector's Report

Sd. 13/6/96

Sd. 15-6-96

Sd. 16/6/96

No. 1576

L.R. 119-95-1

No. 3936

Name of Petitioner, Govindha Shanbhogue

Village, Sulikeranahalli

Taluk, Sreenivasapura

District, Kolar

Date of Arzi, 8-5-96

Date of Receipt, 8-6-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 2

ABSTRACT.

Applies against the order (in Reg. No.) of the Deputy Commr. dt. 4-5-96 directing the petr. to remove from the Kambyrikke.

Petr. urges as follows:-

1. That his land was covered with kirikkal Kambu & that a pit 4' deep & 4' square & thirty yards from the Kambu was excavated and that the Deputy Commr. on Karthavya ordered him to cover up the pit & remove his house thereon. Accordingly he built a house on a part of the land after covering up the pit as directed. That

2 That when there was a complaint by Gopalappa & others regarding this land the Asst. to the Deputy Commr. enquired into the matter, took a Kadaniyar from the villagers & ordered the land to be given to him, as he had dug a large pit, & built a house thereon after filling up the pit, & that the Deputy Commr. on 16-5-87 confirmed the land to him as mentioned above.

1st Qrd 3
2150

(2) Draft

18-6-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition

No. 3936 dated 8-6-96

received at the Dewan's Office from Siddappa Shanbhog of Oopanapalli in the Sreeni-vasapur taluk, appealing against the order of the Dy. Comr. Kolar Dt., No. 346 dated 14-6-96 dismissing the petn. from the Shanbhog-ship of Oopanapalli village, in the said taluk.

L.R. 119-95-2

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District for early submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

By order,

C2 Draft

16/6/96

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
16-6-1896
18.

A.S. 16/6

15/6/96

M.G.C.P.D.—25-4-95—1,000

3 That on the complaint of the said Company & others at a time when the petr was ill, the Govt made a report without making any enquiry into the facts & circumstances referring to previous records

4 That according to the practice prevailing before the Govt that the petr had proceeded diversely before the Govt in 1894 the petr sent in a plan & petition that the Govt would be pleased to direct a Circuit to Ruby, petr's native place, and on his petr returning to Govt the Govt would dispose of this case on receiving the petr from the Municipality without giving the petr an opportunity to represent the true facts & circumstances from the records wherein his said case had been unjustly decided

5 That on this a proceeding a petn to the Govt to make enquiry into the said affair did not lay over head to his representation & did not give due endorsement

6 That the statement of the Govt that the petr was absent is improper because no enquiry was conducted on the date fixed because the petr was not informed that the enquiry had is ordered on a different date

7 That it is against law & justice to dismiss the petn from service on the ground that the petr is absent from the station of the post without giving notice to the Municipality. That the petr is the petitioner duly qualified for the post he was in the petn's profession & enjoyment for upwards of 12 years. That it is wrong that the Govt had imposed such a severe punishment in a matter of this order passed by the Govt.

Prays that his said hereditary office, viz he was been unjustly deprived of by the Govt, be restored to him & that the Provisional order of the Govt be kept in abeyance till the final order of the Govt is passed.

A.J.K.
11.6.96.

3936

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. ON 8-6-96
DATE 8-6-96

ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಮತ್ತು ಅವನ ಸಹೋದರ ಬಲರಾಮ ಇವರಿಬ್ಬರೂ ಕಂಸನ ಆಹ್ವಾನದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಮಥುರೆಗೆ ಬಂದರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಸನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೊಲ್ಲಲು ಹಲವಾರು ಸಂಚುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೂಡಿದ್ದನು. ಅವನ ಆಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಮಲ್ಲಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಣೂರನನ್ನು ಸೋಲಿಸಿ ಕೊಂದನು. ಬಲರಾಮನು ಮುಷ್ಟಿಕನನ್ನು ಕೊಂದನು. ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಕಂಸನ ಕೂದಲನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಎಳೆದು ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬೀಳಿಸಿ ಕೊಂದನು. ಕಂಸನ ಸಾವಿನ ನಂತರ ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಉಗ್ರಸೇನನನ್ನು ಸಿಂಹಾಸನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂರಿಸಿದನು. ಕಂಸನ ಪತ್ನಿಯರಾದ ಅಸ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿ ಇವರು ಕಂಸನ ತಂದೆಯಾದ ಜರಾಸಂಧನಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೇಡು ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಪ್ರಚೋದಿಸಿದರು. ಜರಾಸಂಧನು ಕೃಷ್ಣನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹದಿನೇಳು ಬಾರಿ ಯುದ್ಧ ಮಾಡಿದನು. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಬಾರಿಯೂ ಸೋತು ಹಿಂದಿರುಗಿದನು. ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಜರಾಸಂಧನ ಮೊಮ್ಮಕ್ಕಳಾದ ಅಸ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿಯರನ್ನು ಮದುವೆಯಾದನು. ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಕಂಸನ ಸಾವಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣನಾದ ಕಾರಣ ಜರಾಸಂಧನು ಕೃಷ್ಣನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೇಡು ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸಿದನು. ಆದರೆ ಕೃಷ್ಣನು ಜರಾಸಂಧನ ಮೊಮ್ಮಕ್ಕಳಾದ ಅಸ್ತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿಯರನ್ನು ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಜರಾಸಂಧನು ಕೃಷ್ಣನ ಮೇಲೆ ಯುದ್ಧ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಿಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾವನವರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಗೌಡರು ಇವರು ಕಳೆದ ಕೆಲವು ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಿಂದ ಅನಾರೋಗ್ಯದಿಂದ ಬಳಲುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸೆಗಾಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಅಪೋಲೊ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗೆ ದಾಖಲಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿಕಿತ್ಸೆ ಫಲಕಾರಿಯಾಗದೆ ಇಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ೬.೪೫ ಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಇಹಲೋಕ ತ್ಯಜಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ೭೮ ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವರ ಅಂತ್ಯಕ್ರಿಯೆಯು ನಾಳೆ ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ೧೨ ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಅವರ ಸ್ವಗ್ರಾಮವಾದ ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೆರವೇರಲಿದೆ. ಅವರ ಆತ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಶಾಂತಿ ಕೋರಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿ. ಇಂತಿ ಕುಟುಂಬದವರು.

೯. ಕಾಣೆಯಾಗಿದೆ

ಕಪ್ಪು ಬಣ್ಣದ ಪರ್ಸ್ ಒಂದು ಕಾಣೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಲನಾ ಪರವಾನಗಿ ಪತ್ರ, ಕೆಲವು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವಿತ್ತು. ಪರ್ಸ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕವರು ಕೆಳಗಿನ ವಿಳಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ತಲುಪಿಸಿದರೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಬಹುಮಾನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಿ: ಮಹೇಶ್ ಕುಮಾರ್, ೧೨೩, ೪ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಜಯನಗರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು. ದೂರವಾಣಿ: ೯೮೪೫೦೧೨೩೪೫.

೧೦. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳ ಒಳಗೆ ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು: ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ, ೧೨೩, ೪ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಜಯನಗರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು. ದೂರವಾಣಿ: ೯೮೪೫೦೧೨೩೪೫.

೧೧. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಈ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳ ಒಳಗೆ ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು: ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ, ೧೨೩, ೪ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಜಯನಗರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು. ದೂರವಾಣಿ: ೯೮೪೫೦೧೨೩೪೫.

ਸ਼ਰਮਾ ਮੋਟਰ ਵਰਕਸ

ਮਿਤੀ 8-6-96

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਮੈਨੇਜਰ ਸਾਹਿਬ

ਵਿਸ਼ਾ:- ਮੋਟਰ ਸਾਈਕਲ ਦੀ ਸਰਵਿਸ ਕਰਨ ਬਾਰੇ।

ਮੈਨੂੰ ਆਪਣੇ ਮੋਟਰ ਸਾਈਕਲ ਦੀ ਸਰਵਿਸ ਕਰਵਾਉਣੀ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੈਂ ਆਪਣਾ ਮੋਟਰ ਸਾਈਕਲ ਕੱਲ੍ਹ ਸਵੇਰੇ 9 ਵਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਕੋਲ ਭੇਜ ਰਿਹਾ ਹਾਂ। ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਦੀ ਸਰਵਿਸ ਕਰ ਦਿਓ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਦੇ ਟਾਇਰ ਵੀ ਬਦਲ ਦਿਓ। ਮੈਂ ਸ਼ਾਮ ਨੂੰ ਆਪਣਾ ਮੋਟਰ ਸਾਈਕਲ ਲੈ ਜਾਵਾਂਗਾ।

ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਸਹਿਤ

ਤੁਹਾਡਾ ਵਿਸ਼ਵਾਸ ਪਾਤਰ

ਰਾਜੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ

9/57 (4)

Gen. 31.]



From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

To The Secretary to the
Government Revenue of Mysore.

No. R. 119-95-3

Dated 25th July 96

Despatched 30th

Received

General No. 483

No. 116

Enclosure No. 1 file

Reporting on the petition
from Narasimha Setty
Channapura Sri Richard &
Srinivaspuri Sub Dasil

Petitions Branch
31/7
Take into notice.
1/8

Submitted with reference to the
2nd Commissioner's order on the
abstract of petition No 3936
dated 8-6-96.

3/8/96

By order &c is to be noted that the
Revenue Appellate Petn
Issues to be prepared in the Inam matter
& that no appeal lies &c &c
Noticed
4/8
Krishnayya
Attended to
4/8

The Record prepared by the Asst Commr
& an abstract is impeached
are herewith submitted with the
records of the Case received from the
Dy Commr & the Petn of Some of
them preferred by the Petitioner - their
is an appeal from the order of the
Dy Commr Kolar dismissing the petition
from the Inamdars of Channapura, Sri Richard,
Srinivaspuri Sub Dasil, for mis-
appropriation of Govt property,
Sreenivasapur Sub Taluk, for mis-
appropriation of Govt property

file -
B.M. Sub-Warden
10/8/ 4/8

Kolar Gold Mines Commissioners'
Office, Bangalore 20th July 1896.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your official memorandum No: $\frac{\text{Rev}}{2150}$ dated 16th June 1896 forwarding for report a petition from Lakshmipathi, late Karnam of Kopparahalli, Srinivasapur Sub-Taluk, appealing against the order dismissing him from the Karnamship of the said village, I have the honor to submit herewith as per accompanying Serishtadar's records connected with the case, a note which is attached an order passed in English by Mr. J. G. Krishnaiengar Officiating Special Commissioner on the 14th instant 1896.

2 It will be observed from the same that the Petitioner was dismissed for having defrauded Government by misappropriating Kolar record office measuring 4 ½ square yards and

subsequently

subsequently selling it with the building
erected by him thereon and have for me
31
3. The enclosures from Messrs Gardiner
under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

Secretary of Legation

Future Minister

Tien

34

Pet
443

Copy of the above
Endorsement is for
-warded to the Dy Com
Kolar district with
~~xxxxxxxx~~ the records
received with his letter
no 483/116 dated 25th inst

By order

BBR
for secretary

M 7/9

Registered
No. 20 NS

16 97 Appl 29 Nov 96
1716

Refer Judicial

27/5

Submitted with reference to the Secretary's order on the petn "Let me see the record". The matter was disposed of by the 2nds (vide proceedings 20.8.96 and the application for review No 1697 of 29.11.96 was on 22.12.96 declining to reopen the matter —

Petr has now appealed to H. Highness the Maharaja Regent

29/5/97

This was swiped up with some old papers, and escaped notice till they were forwarded from the office this date

6/7/97

Put to Secretary

Petr is informed by the Secretary's letter of the 27th inst. that his appeal from the application for review could not be entertained in the 2nd Council. The proceedings in the case show the facts of the case. M 10/7/97

Filed

This may be rejected.

35 189

No. 3077

Name of Petitioner Chellakka alias Kattokaran

Village Kizhiparathalle

Taluk Ernad

District Malabar

Date of Appl 15th January 97.

Date of Receipt 22nd May 97.

Date of Disposal R. 119-95-5

No. of Enclosures Eight.

ABSTRACT.

This office Lr No 1697 dated 29.11.96 declining to reopen the case.

Petr now states that Secretary in addition to what he already had to say in the matter has now found that the Secretary may therefore be directed to reinstate the suit under complaint, and that the record of the case be sent for

that the record of the assessing officer, may be perused, and that justice may be done in her case. Wherefore the petitioner prays that order may be given to stop the execution of the warrant of distress. Commissioner's order No 346 of 14.11.96, ordering the withdrawal of his proposed application.

The annexures of the petition are;

(1) Money order receipt for Rs 10.

(2) Bill of costs submitted by the petitioner with her petition to the Magistrate.

(3) The assessment No 6,99 of 1.8.95, sent to the petitioner.

(4) Copy of a letter submitted by the deputy commissioner in the petitioner's case.

(5) Copy of deputy Commissioner's order No 345, under appeal.

(6) Deputy commissioner's No 1/1 of 1.4.96, stating that an order has already been passed by the assessor in the matter.

(7) do - do - 20.5, stating that if she is not contented with his order, she may prefer an appeal against it.

(8) Copy of petitioner's statement before the assessor on 26.2.95.

26.11.97

Let me see the petition and report
before write ord

Dy. S.R.D.
12/2/98

Submit.
Dy.C.S.
14/2/98.
Ref.
Dy.R.D.
16/2/98.

Refer
18/2/98

[illegible]
Dist
22/2/98
Sub.C.

MJ
23/2/98

Mr. Ameen file of these papers,
place the petition & the [illegible]
after [illegible]
S.R.D.

MJ 24/2/98

Open file is made
24/2/98.

25-2-98

Sub Collr.

MJ 28/2/98

No grd
case closed
2/3/98

(10)

1898

No. 2034 Petition to the Sub Collector, Gudiyatham

Name of Petitioner Siddappa - Srinivasappa

Village Kasipallli

Taluk Srinivaspur

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 3-12-97

Date of Receipt 15-2-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2.

L.R. 107 — 95 — 6

ABSTRACT

Stated 2 persons re boundary dispute
between Mr. Jean and his brother
the village of Kasipallli Srinivaspur
Taluk - Mr. Jean applied a
complaint copies of the matter
had decided by the Mr. Jean
the said piece of land applied
land and took possession - that
the Mr. Jean's brother disputed
Survey and gave it to Jean
to do so they filed petition -
that is the petition also is
received from, caused disturbance
with respect of the land that
the said matter, Jean's brother
said the place of dispute

P. 2094

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 2094
DATE 15-2-38

ಕಾಲ್ಪನಿಕ ಕಥೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡುಬರುವ ಅಸಮಾನತೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬೆಳಕು ಚೆಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಪಾತ್ರಗಳು ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಕಾಣುವ ಜನರನ್ನೇ ಹೋಲುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಕಥೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಪಾತ್ರಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಲೇಖಕರು

ಕಾಲಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಕಣ್ಣೀರು ಸುರಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡಾಡಿ ಬೇಡಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಅವನ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಕರಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವನು ಅವಳನ್ನು ಕೊಲೆ ಮಾಡಿಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟನು. ಅವಳ ಹೆಣವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೂಳಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಅವನು ಮನೆಗೆ ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿ ಬಂದನು. ಅವನ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯು ಅವನನ್ನು ಕಂಡು ಅವಳ ತಂಗಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿದಳು. ಅವಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅವನು ಸುಳ್ಳು ಹೇಳಿದನ

L. R. 1189-95

Yours sincerely,

J. M. Keynes

29/6/38

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಬೆಲೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡು ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದರು.